

**MINUTES**  
**Faculty Senate Academic Affairs**  
**May 2, 2006, 3:30 p.m.**  
**K-State Union, Room 204**

Present: Couvelha, Dodd, Fairchild, Higgins, Martin, Stewart, Trussell  
Absent: Collins, Erickson, Lehew, Sachs, Stokes, Thompson  
Visitors: Jackie Spears and Monty Nielsen

1. Alice Trussell, Chair, call the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.
2. The April 18, 2006 minutes were approved as amended.
3. Announcements
  - Fairchild brought up the university-wide honors program. He expressed concern about the program and the fact that no sufficient curriculum is available. Trussell reported that his colleagues on campus have also expressed similar concerns.
  - New faculty senator orientation as well as the faculty senate meeting will be May 9<sup>th</sup>.
4. Investigation and Adjudication Procedures for Honor System – Jackie Spears – **Attachment 1**  
Spears gave some background information on the Honor System. It was developed in the late 1990s and its by-laws and constitution had approval from Faculty Senate. It came to light last year that the wording in the university handbook, student handbook, and on the website was different. Senator Spears, as president of Faculty Senate at the time, was requested to review this issue. She formed an ad hoc committee that included members of Faculty Senate, Student Senate, the Honor Council and Honor System staff. They worked together to amend the constitution so the by-laws would be converted to a set of investigation and adjudication procedures. These would be reviewed by Faculty Senate every five years beginning in 2005 with the provision that interim changes could be made. The ad hoc committee reconvened this past semester to make other modifications to the constitution.

The document presented at this meeting reflects the changes made by the ad hoc committee that now need Faculty Senate approval. These changes include wording to indicate the Provost will also be involved in the approval process of changes to the Honor System constitution; under section B. Reporting Honor Pledge Violations, it is strongly *urging* faculty to report honor pledge violations, however, it is not mandatory; also there are changes involving the confidentiality during proceedings of a hearing as well as the appeals process.

Trussell reported that Gunile DeVault, Registrar's office, voiced concern that a student could possibly drop a class for which they're being accused of an honor violation and it would never be noted on their record. It was suggested that a student's account could be frozen if an honor system violation is brought against them. A lengthy discussion continued on freezing a student's account or freezing it in the sense that the student would have to remain in the course until a decision was made. It was noted this course of action could have a major affect on a student's academic future and also a student may not wish to continue in the course once a decision has been made. Dodd offered several editorial suggestions which Spears will take back with her. Committee members decided no action should be taken on this item today, but that the issues highlighted should be discussed with David Allen, Director of the Honor System Director, first. Spears will visit with him and hopefully bring this document back for a vote at our next meeting on May 16<sup>th</sup>.

5. Course and Curriculum Changes - none
6. Committee Reports
  - A. University Library Committee – Alice Trussell  
The Library committee recently met with Provost Nellis. They are trying to get a financial commitment from him to make sure the library has the necessary resources to function properly.
  - B. Committee on Academic Policy and Procedures (CAPP) – Alice Trussell

Their next meeting will be May 10<sup>th</sup>.

C. Student Senate – Gavin Couvelha

Student Senate had their last meeting this past Thursday and they will start back up in the fall semester. One item of business they will be working on over the summer is structuring and providing a mission to their newly formed University Relations committee, which was a combining of two different student senate committees.

D. Laser Steering Committee – Robert Stokes (Nielsen)

Nielsen reported that the committee met this month. The K-State LASER project is moving to Oracle People Soft Campus Solutions. Sometime between May 15<sup>th</sup> and June 30<sup>th</sup> a group of consultants will be coming to meet with functional personnel on campus and they will then make recommendations regarding several items including resources needed to go live with this system.

E. University General Education Council – Judy Collins

No report.

F. General Education committee – Melody Lehew

No report.

7. Election of Academic Affairs Committee Chair

A nomination was previously made for Fred Fairchild to chair the Academic Affairs committee for 2006-2007. A motion was made by Dodd and seconded by Stewart to close nominations. Motion passed. Fred Fairchild was voted as the new Chair of Academic Affairs for 2006-2007.

8. For the good of the university

Trussell commended all committee members for their hard work during this academic year and gave a brief review of all the items Academic Affairs has had input on over the year. The first day attendance policy was passed, Academic Definitions were passed, changes to Graduation Scholastic Honors were passed, an amended enrollment cap was passed, the provost created a committee to review general education at K-State in which Melody Lehew has been a volunteer, the university assessment survey committee completed their work and turned their report and revised surveys in to the Provost, faculty rights in the classroom were discussed and the provost reaffirmed the integrity of the status of the faculty member and he will continue to work to insure that information about faculty resources are fully communicated to all faculty members and GTA's, the academic climate in the student union was addressed and are continuing to be worked on, both the Honor System and University Honors Program have been discussed, the LASER project has been given support by the Academic Affairs committee and a pre-requisite fast track form was created to help with this endeavor, the policy on certificate programs has been passed and will be voted on at our next faculty senate meeting, also the approval, routing and notification committee has been formed. Only one more member from classified personnel is needed. Members of the committee are as follows: Kelli Cox as Chair, Charlotte Pfaff, Karen Pence, Carol Shanklin, and Loren Wilson. The committee has not convened yet for its first meeting, but a letter has been sent out to members giving them their charge. They will revise, update and replace the existing policy; they will examine the option for a tiered approach to processing changes according to complexity; they will design web-based forms through which information can be entered; they will create a flow chart illustrating all steps that are required to complete a process; and they will ensure all procedures will meet requirements set forth in the Kansas Board of Regents Policy and Procedures manual.

Stewart, on behalf of the committee, sincerely thanked Trussell for her dedication in leading the Academic Affairs committee this year.

9. The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

**Attachment 1**  
**Honor System**  
**Proposed Investigation and Adjudication Procedures**

**Background**

At its June 14, 2005 meeting Faculty Senate approved changes to Article X of the Honor System Constitution, changing the title “BYLAW REVISIONS” to “INVESTIGATION AND ADJUDICATION PROCEDURES” and setting forth a process by which these procedures would be reviewed at five year intervals beginning in 2005.

During the past semester an ad hoc committee convened by Past President Spears has been working to convert the bylaws to a set of investigation and adjudication procedures. The committee consisted of representatives from Faculty Senate, Student Senate, and the Honor Council as well as Honor System staff. Under the old Honor System Constitution, changes to the bylaws needed to be approved only by the Honor Council. Helene Marcoux, Associate Director of the Honor System, compiled a document detailing the changes made to the bylaws since 1999. However, it was not a simple matter to move from the format used in the bylaws to a format that would be user friendly. Consequently, the decision was made to start with a fresh document, incorporate as much of the bylaws that still applied, and update the remaining material to reflect current practice.

This document is being considered by the Honor Council and will eventually need to be approved by both Student Senate and Faculty Senate.

**Proposed Action**

We are looking for Faculty Senate approval of the proposed “Investigation and Adjudication Procedures.” Upon approval by both Faculty Senate and Student Senate, this document will be posted to the Honor System website. Changes can be made by a 2/3 vote of the Honor Council and approval by the Provost. These changes will be incorporated into the annual report prepared by the Honor System staff and submitted to Faculty Senate every fall. In 2010 and at subsequent five-year intervals thereafter, interim changes made to the document are to be approved by Faculty Senate and Student Senate.

2 HONOR SYSTEM

3  
4 INVESTIGATION AND ADJUDICATION PROCEDURES  
5 (Formerly Honor System Bylaws)  
6  
7  
8

9 **Kansas State University has an Honor System based on personal integrity, which is presumed to**  
10 **be sufficient assurance in academic matters that one's work is performed honestly and without**  
11 **unauthorized assistance. All full and part-time students enrolled in undergraduate and graduate**  
12 **courses on-campus, off-campus, and via distance learning, by registration in those courses,**  
13 **acknowledge the jurisdiction of the Honor System.**  
14

15 A. Purpose

16  
17 The Investigation and Adjudication Procedures have been developed for the purpose of administering  
18 the Kansas State University Honor System. As set out in Article X of the Honor System Constitution,  
19 the Investigation and Adjudication Procedures were approved by the Honor Council, Student Senate,  
20 and Faculty Senate in 2006 and are subsequently subject to periodic review by those three governance  
21 bodies at 5 year intervals beginning in 2010. Interim revisions to the Investigation and Adjudication  
22 Procedures may be made upon approval by a 2/3 vote of the Honor Council and upon approval by the  
23 Provost. The Investigation and Adjudication Procedures must be posted at the Honor System website  
24 (<http://www.k-state.edu/honor>) and updated regularly.  
25

26 B. Reporting Honor Pledge Violations

27  
28 Faculty and students report violations of the Honor Pledge to the Honor System Director by filling out  
29 the Honor System Violation Report form available at [http://www.k-](http://www.k-state.edu/honor/faculty/reportform.html)  
30 [state.edu/honor/faculty/reportform.html](http://www.k-state.edu/honor/faculty/reportform.html). When the report is made by a student, the Director will  
31 consult with the faculty member who is the instructor of the course about filing an Honor Pledge  
32 Violation Report.  
33

34 Faculty members are urged to report the alleged violation to the Office of the Honor System when:

- 35  
36 a. the faculty member alleges a violation and imposes an academic sanction, (An  
37 academic sanction is any action that would lower a student's grade on an assignment.)  
38 or b. the faculty member alleges a violation and requests an investigation. The  
39 case investigation concludes once a decision has been made as to whether there is  
40 sufficient information to proceed to the adjudication stage.  
41  
42  
43  
44

45 Faculty members who allege an Honor Pledge violation need not report an alleged violation to the  
46 Office of the Honor System when:

- 47  
48 a. a faculty member alleges a violation and issues a warning but imposes no academic  
49 sanction;  
50 or b. a faculty member alleges a violation, issues a warning, provides the  
51 student an opportunity to correct the transgression, but imposes no academic sanction;  
52 or c. a faculty member alleges a violation, issues a warning, provides an

53 opportunity for the student to redo the assignment or take the exam again, but imposes  
54 no academic sanction.

55  
56 Honor Pledge Violation reports shall be submitted to the Honor System Director within twenty (20)  
57 class days of the violation or of the discovery of the violation. In certain situations, it is acceptable for  
58 a verbal notification to be given within the notification period. This situation might occur when a  
59 faculty member is conducting an internal investigation. A written report must follow the verbal report  
60 within a reasonable amount of time.

61  
62 Faculty members have two options for filing an Honor Pledge Violation Report. Option One allows the  
63 faculty member to conduct her/his own investigation and identify the specific sanction for the  
64 violation. In this situation, Alleged Violators may contest only the allegation. If they do so, the case is  
65 turned over to the Honor System for investigation and adjudication. Option Two allows the faculty  
66 member to turn the case directly over to the Honor System for investigation and adjudication. The  
67 faculty member may recommend a sanction. Alleged Violators may contest the allegation and propose  
68 an alternate sanction during the adjudication phase, but the Honor System Hearing Panel makes the  
69 final determination of the sanction.

70  
71 Once a report has been filed by the faculty member, hereafter referred to as the Faculty Reporter, the  
72 Director notifies the Alleged Violator(s) of the allegation, of the right to review the Violation report,  
73 and of the right to contest the allegation. The Faculty Reporter and the Alleged Violator are  
74 encouraged to resolve the issue prior to proceeding to the investigation process. If the issue is resolved  
75 to the satisfaction of the Alleged Violator and the Faculty Reporter, a report of the agreed upon  
76 resolution is filed with the Office of the Honor System. If the matter is not resolved to the satisfaction  
77 of both the Faculty Reporter and the Alleged Violator, the Director initiates a case investigation.

### 78 79 C. Investigating Honor Pledge Violations

80  
81 When the Director initiates a case investigation, the Associate Director appoints a member of the  
82 Honor Council or the Honesty & Integrity Peer Educators (HIPE) to serve as an Advisor to the Alleged  
83 Violator during the investigation and adjudication process, if the violation proceeds to adjudication.  
84 The Alleged Violator may at any time appoint someone else to serve as his/her Advisor, by notifying  
85 the Director

86  
87 The Faculty Reporter may, in consultation with the Director, withdraw the allegation at any time  
88 during the investigation process. Such withdrawal will cause the investigation to be terminated. In the  
89 event that a report is withdrawn, the Director shall ensure that all documentation is sealed and retained  
90 in the Office of the Honor System. .

91  
92 The Director appoints two members of the Honor Council (one faculty and one student) to serve as  
93 Case Investigators. If the Alleged Violator is a graduate student, the student Case Investigator is a  
94 graduate student and the faculty Case Investigator is a member of the Graduate Faculty.

95  
96 The Director arranges for the Case Investigators to meet separately with the Faculty Reporter and the  
97 Alleged Violator to review the Violation Report and other relevant information to determine if it  
98 appears an Honor Pledge violation has occurred. If needed, the Director arranges a meeting between  
99 the Case Investigators and any witness(es) as part of the investigative process.

100  
101 During the course of the investigation the Alleged Violator is advised not to contact the Faculty  
102 Reporter to discuss aspects of the case. In the same manner, the Faculty Reporter is advised not to  
103 discuss the case with the Alleged Violator. Normal academic contact is permitted, however. In the  
104 event that the Director feels the need to protect the Faculty Reporter, Alleged Violator, or any

105 witnesses involved in the investigation, the Director may take appropriate steps to protect the integrity  
106 of the process.

107  
108 The Case Investigators submit a report to the Director that concludes whether there IS or IS NOT  
109 sufficient information to proceed to an adjudication hearing. If the Case Investigators conclude that  
110 there IS NOT sufficient information to proceed to a hearing, the Director notifies the Alleged Violator  
111 and the Faculty Reporter that no further action will be taken. The records are sealed and retained in the  
112 Office of the Honor System. If the Case Investigators conclude that there IS sufficient information to  
113 proceed to a hearing, the Director informs the Alleged Violator and the Faculty Reporter and appoints  
114 an Honor Council Hearing Panel.

#### 115 116 D. Adjudicating Honor Pledge Violations

117  
118 When an Honor Pledge violation has proceeded to the adjudication stage, the Director appoints a panel  
119 of six members drawn from the membership of the Honor Council. Each panel consists of five voting  
120 members and one non-voting chairperson. If the Alleged Violator is a graduate student, student  
121 members of the hearing panel are graduate students and faculty members are members of the Graduate  
122 Faculty. The Director appoints the chair, alternating in successive cases between a faculty member and  
123 a student member of the Honor Council. Voting membership of hearing panels consists of three  
124 students and two faculty members.

125  
126 Hearing panels are normally convened within ten class days of the conclusion of the investigation.  
127 During the summer as well as January, May and August Intersessions, the Director may postpone  
128 Honor Council hearings until the beginning of the subsequent fall or spring semester. Those notified of  
129 the date, time, and place of the hearing are the Alleged Violator and the HIPE Advisor, the Faculty  
130 Reporter, the Case Investigators, and any witnesses.

131  
132 In preparation for the hearing, the Director prepares copies of all necessary documentation required by  
133 the Hearing Panelists, Faculty Reporter, and/or Alleged Violator. A copy of the Case Investigation  
134 Report and supporting documentation will be made available to the Alleged Violator and Faculty  
135 Reporter at least three (3) class days prior to the hearing date. The Alleged Violator will sign a record  
136 of notification acknowledging that he/she received the information and will honor expectations of  
137 confidentiality.

138  
139 Alleged violations filed under this policy are confidential and should not be disclosed to anyone who  
140 does not have a need to know. The University cannot guarantee absolute confidentiality because the  
141 University is obligated to investigate complaints. Supervisors and administrators are obligated to keep  
142 complaints confidential and protect the privacy of all parties to the extent possible consistent with  
143 preventing future acts of academic dishonesty, providing a remedy to persons injured and allowing  
144 Alleged Violators to reply to a complaint if any disciplinary action is anticipated. Alleged Violators as  
145 well as student witnesses are similarly bound by this expectation of confidentiality. Complaint  
146 information may be disclosed to state or federal anti-discrimination agencies for investigations and  
147 during litigation.

148  
149 At the hearing, the Alleged Violator represents himself/herself. During the hearing, the Alleged  
150 Violator may consult as necessary with his/her Advisor. Voluntary failure by the Alleged Violator to  
151 appear before the Hearing Panel neither halts nor interrupts the proceedings.

152  
153 The Director prepares the hearing panel script to be followed during the hearing. The script includes a  
154 specific sequence for introducing information by each of the involved parties. The Faculty Reporter,  
155 Alleged Violator, and Case Investigators are to inform the Director of any witnesses to be introduced

156 during the hearing at least 3 class days prior to the scheduled hearing. The script is read by the Hearing  
157 Panel Chair.

158  
159 The Hearing Panel Chair accepts for consideration all information that reasonable persons would  
160 accept as having evidentiary value during hearing panel proceedings. Character witnesses and personal  
161 references are not permitted. Formal rules of evidence are not applied.

162  
163 Whether an Honor Pledge Violation occurred is determined by a simple majority of the five voting  
164 members on the Hearing Panel.

165  
166 The decision of the Honor Council Hearing Panel is reported to the Director, who then notifies in  
167 writing the Alleged Violator, Faculty Reporter, the Faculty Reporter's Department Chair or Head, and  
168 (in the event there is a sanction of XF) the Dean of the Faculty Reporter's and Violator's College of  
169 the Hearing Panel's decision. In a case involving a graduate student the Director will notify the above  
170 individuals as well as the Dean of the Graduate School and the student's Graduate Program  
171 Coordinator. If the hearing Panel determines that a violation of the Honor Pledge occurred, it imposes  
172 or upholds the appropriate sanction.

173  
174  
175 All hearings are recorded and kept as part of the permanent record of the adjudication procedures.  
176 Records are confidential and subject to applicable privacy laws. Records are made available to  
177 authorized parties upon the determination of the Director.

178  
179  
180 E. Sanctions

181  
182 The standard sanction for an Honor Pledge violation shall be the assignment of an XF on the student's  
183 transcript. The XF denotes failure in the course due to academic dishonesty – an Honor Pledge  
184 violation. If a sanction includes an XF, the Director shall contact the Registrar's office and authorize  
185 the grade of XF when:

- 186
- 187 • the Violator does not contest the allegation, or
  - 188 • the case has been adjudicated, the hearing panel has issued a sanction, and the Violator chooses  
189 not to appeal the Hearing Panel's decision, or
  - 190 • the time period for contesting the violation has expired and the Violator has failed to contact  
191 the Director.

192  
193 When the appeals process is initiated immediately following the hearing, the Director shall postpone  
194 the grade change until such time as the appeals process is resolved.

195  
196 If a sanction includes the requirement that the Violator complete the Development and Integrity  
197 course, described at the Honor System web site <ksu.edu/honor>, the Faculty Reporter records an  
198 Incomplete for the course grade. If the Violator fails to successfully complete the Development and  
199 Integrity course in two semesters, then the Associate Director authorizes the Registrar to change the  
200 Incomplete to an XF. If the Violator successfully completes the Development and Integrity course,  
201 then the Associate Director contacts the Faculty Reporter who then replaces the Incomplete with the  
202 final grade earned in the course.

203  
204 The Hearing Panel may deviate from the XF grade sanction and consider any of the following  
205 sanctions for violations of the Honor Pledge:

206

- 207 • A failing grade for the assignment in connection with which the violation of the Honor Pledge  
208 occurred
- 209 • A requirement to complete the Development and Integrity course prior to receiving a final  
210 grade in the class in which the Honor Pledge violation occurred
- 211 • Recommendation to the Provost that the student be suspended from the University
- 212 • Recommendation to the Provost that the student be expelled from the University
- 213 • Other appropriate educational sanction such as community service

214  
215 In the event that an Honor Pledge Violation report cannot be resolved prior to the end of a semester,  
216 the Faculty Reporter records an Incomplete until such time as the alleged violation is resolved. The  
217 Honor System Director will make every effort to resolve these conflicts prior to the end of the semester  
218 but does have the right to postpone the Investigation and Adjudication process during Intersessions and  
219 summer semesters.

#### 220 221 F. Appeal of a Hearing Panel Decision

222  
223 Appeals are to be based on procedural irregularities or substantial new information. Appeals based on  
224 procedural irregularities must be presented in writing to the Director within 15 days of an Honor  
225 Council Hearing Panel decision. Appeals based on substantial new information must be presented in  
226 writing to the Director within one year from the date of an Honor Council Hearing Panel decision. The  
227 Director determines whether an appeal based on substantial new information or procedural  
228 irregularities might have impacted the investigation or adjudication procedure. Following this  
229 determination, the Director may:

- 230 ,
- 231
  - 232 1. reconvene the Hearing Panel to hear new information, or
  - 233 2. appoint a new Hearing Panel and conduct a new hearing, or
  - 234 3. appoint new Case Investigators and a new Hearing Panel, or
  - 235 4. take such other action as the Director feels appropriate.

236  
237 The Director then notifies the Faculty Reporter and Alleged Violator in writing of the decision and the  
238 process to be followed.

#### 239 240 241 G. Conflict of Interest

242  
243 Members of the Honor Council involved in the investigation or adjudication procedures of a case will  
244 immediately notify the Director of any conflicts of interest. The Director may remove an Honor  
245 Council member from the investigation and adjudication process if sufficient information exists to  
246 support a conflict of interest.

247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254